

CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI, OLSTEIN, BRODY & AGNELLO, P.C.
COUNSELLORS AT LAW

CHARLES C. CARELLA
BRENDAN T. BYRNE
PETER G. STEWART
ELLIOT M. OLSTEIN
ARTHUR T. VANDERBILT, II
JAN ALAN BRODY
JOHN M. AGNELLO
CHARLES M. CARELLA
JAMES E. CECCHI

JAMES D. CECCHI (1933-1995)
JOHN G. GILFILLAN III (1936-2008)

JAMES T. BYERS
DONALD F. MICELI
A. RICHARD ROSS
KENNETH L. WINTERS
JEFFREY A. COOPER
CARL R. WOODWARD, III
MELISSA E. FLAX
DENNIS F. GLEASON
DAVID G. GILFILLAN
G. GLENNON TROUBLEFIELD
BRIAN H. FENLON
LINDSEY H. TAYLOR
CAROLINE F. BARTLETT

5 BECKER FARM ROAD
ROSELAND, N.J. 07068-1739
PHONE (973) 994-1700
FAX (973) 994-1744
www.carellabyrne.com

RICHARD K. MATANLE, II
FRANCIS C. HAND
AVRAM S. EULE
RAYMOND W. FISHER
OF COUNSEL

RAYMOND J. LILLIE
WILLIAM SQUIRE
ALAN J. GRANT^o
STEPHEN R. DANEK
ERIC MAGNELLI
DONALD A. ECKLUND
AUDRA E. PETROLLE
MEGAN A. NATALE
AMANDA J. BARISICH
ZACHARY S. BOWER+
MICHAEL CROSS

^oMEMBER NY BAR ONLY
+MEMBER FL BAR ONLY

July 17, 2012

VIA ECF

Honorable Jose L. Linares, U.S.D.J.
United States District Court
M.L. King, Jr. Federal Building & Courthouse
50 Walnut Street
Newark, New Jersey 07101

Re: *Larson, et al. v. Sprint, et al.*
Civil Action No. 07-5325 (JLL)

Dear Judge Linares:

We are co-counsel for the Class in the above matter. This responds to the letters recently filed by counsel for the Galleguillos objectors, Docket Entry 661, and Sprint, Docket Entry 662, relating to the upcoming case management conference on August 1.

We agree with Sprint that the Third Circuit made no finding that the present class representatives were inadequate. Rather, the Third Circuit remanded for further factual findings as to the adequacy of the class representatives in light of the “donut hole” issue first raised by the Galleguillos objectors at oral argument of the appeal. Class Counsel believes that any valid issues relating to the adequacy of the class representatives and/or the “donut hole” issue can be resolved without negotiating a new settlement.

That being said, Class Counsel believes that the Galleguillos objectors’ participation in the August 1 conference would be productive. If for no other reason, we believe that the parties and the Court should address California counsel’s efforts to revive the California litigation against Sprint which is encompassed by the Settlement here. If California counsel wishes to participate in this process in a productive way, it is certainly unusual to simultaneously seek to upset the settlement in another forum.

Honorable Jose L. Linares, U.S.D.J.
July 17, 2012
Page 2

We look forward to speaking with Your Honor about all of these issues on August 1.

Respectfully submitted,

CARELLA, BYRNE, CECCHI,
OLSTEIN, BRODY & AGNELLO

/s/ James E. Cecchi

JAMES E. CECCHI

cc: All Counsel (via ECF)